UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,367	06/14/2001	Pankai K. Jha	0325.00483	8769

21565 7590 05/03/2005

CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.
24840 HARPER
ST. CLAIR SHORES, MI 48080

EXAMINER	
PATEL, HARESH N	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/881,367	JHA, PANKAI K.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Haresh Patel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 November 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) 18 is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 2, 8 are amended. Claims 3-7 and 9-16 are previously presented. Claims 17-20 are added.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/26/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of claims 1-16 is maintained.

Applicant argues, (1) "a next rejection be presented in a non-final office action due to large ambiguities in the current rejections". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, which the cited reference teach at several places. As per the claimed invention, the invention accomplishes a method / a circuit for bridging an incoming packet from a first network to a second network (see claims 1 and 16). For clarification, Ogawa discloses a method (e.g., col., 3, lines 44 – 59) / a circuit (e.g., col., 6, lines 56 – 67) for bridging (e.g., col., 5, lines 11 – 15) an incoming packet (e.g., col., 4, line 65 – col., 5, line 6) from a first network to a second network (e.g., col., 5, lines 11 – 15, e.g., use of internetwork repeater between first and second networks, col., 12, lines 41 – 49, col., 2, lines 5 – 14). Also, page 22, lines 16 –20 of the specification, clearly states, "While the invention has been particularly shown and described with reference to the preferred embodiments thereof, will be understood by those skilled in the art that various changes form and details may be made without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter.

Applicant argues, (2) Ogawa et al., 5,936,966 (Hereinafter Ogawa) expressly or inherently does not disclose a circuit comprising (of claim 16) and steps (of claim 1), reading a pointer for a first parameter within an incoming packer from a first network, processing the first parameter in accordance with the pointer to produce a second parameter, presenting an outgoing packet containing the second parameter for a second network". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. As per the claimed invention, Ogawa discloses reading a pointer (e.g., col., 13, lines 50 –55) for a first parameter (e.g., col., 13, lines 15 – 21) within an incoming packet (e.g., col., 12, lines 53 – 63, figure 5) from a first network (e.g., col., 5, lines 11 – 15, col., 12, lines 41 – 49, col., 2, lines 5 – 14), processing the first parameter (e.g., col., 13, lines 15 – 21) in accordance with the pointer (e.g., col., 13, lines 50 –55) to produce a second parameter (e.g., col., 9, lines 7 – 24), presenting an outgoing packet (e.g., col., 8, lines 50 – 63) containing the second parameter (e.g., col., 9, lines 7 – 24) for a second network (e.g., col., 5, lines 11 – 15, col., 12, lines 41 – 49, col., 2, lines 5 – 14). Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (2), "limitations rejected under Official Notice, i.e., "processing is non-programmable", is not well known in the art, and the motivation do not exist". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. For example, Yusa et al., 5,633,806, discloses the well-known concept of non-programmable processing (e.g., use of fixed function in the core region, col., 14, lines 6 – 21). The concept of non-programmable processing would help process the steps taught by the Ogawa. The usage of non-programmable circuit design would help increase the degree of freedom of circuit design. Also, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of a

primary reference. It is also not that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinally skill in the art. In re Keller, 642 F.2d 414, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981); In re Young, 927 F.2d 588, 591, 18 USPQ2d 1089, 1091 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Double Patenting

3. Applicant's submission of terminal disclosure to overcome double patenting rejection with copending application 09/881,493, dated 11/26/2004 has been acknowledged.

Response to Amendment

4. The amendment to the specification, paragraph starting on page 13, line 16, dated 11/26/2004, has been acknowledged.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities:

an apparent typing error in "plurality of peripheral means at least one".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-8, 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1O2(e) as being anticipated by Ogawa et al. 5,936,966 (Hereinafter Ogawa).

8. As per claims 1 and 16, Ogawa teaches a method (e.g., col., 3, lines 44 – 59) / a circuit (e.g., col., 6, lines 56 – 67) for bridging (e.g., col., 5, lines 11 – 15) an incoming packet (e.g., col., 4, line 65 – col., 5, line 6) from a first network to a second network (e.g., col., 5, lines 11 – 15, e.g., use of internetwork repeater between first and second networks, col., 12, lines 41 – 49, col., 2, lines 5 – 14) comprising:

reading a pointer (e.g., col., 13, lines 50 –55) for a first parameter (e.g., col., 13, lines 15 – 21) within an incoming packet (e.g., col., 12, lines 53 – 63, figure 5) complaint with a network protocol (e.g., col., 7, lines 54 - 58),

processing the first parameter (e.g., col., 13, lines 15 – 21) in accordance with the pointer (e.g., col., 13, lines 50 –55) to produce a second parameter (e.g., col., 9, lines 7 – 24), and

presenting an outgoing packet (e.g., col., 8, lines 50 – 63) containing said second parameter (e.g., col., 9, lines 7 – 24) for said second network (e.g., col., 5, lines 11 – 15, col., 12, lines 41 – 49, col., 2, lines 5 – 14).

9. As per claims 2 and 17, Ogawa teaches the following:

reading a length and an offset for said first parameter (e.g., lines 27 - 65, col., 9),

partitioning said incoming packet in accordance with said offset and said length to extract said first parameter prior to processing (e.g., lines 27 - 65, col., 9).

10. As per claim 3, Ogawa teaches the following:

downloading said offset, said length, and said pointer prior to reading (e.g., lines 27 - 65, col, 9).

11. As per claim 4, Ogawa teaches the following:

routing said first parameter at least one of plurality of peripheral blocks identified by said pointer prior to processing (e.g., col., 3, lines 44 - 65), wherein said peripheral blocks perform said processing (e.g., lines 44 - 60, col., 4) and

assembling said second parameter into said outgoing packet in response to processing (e.g., line 54, col., 7 - line 12, col., 8).

12. As per claim 5, Ogawa teaches the following:

reading second offset and a second length for second network protocol prior to assembling said outgoing packet (e.g., lines 19 - 67, page 10).

13. As per claim 6, Ogawa teaches the following:

routing said first parameter to an external peripheral block identified by said pointer prior to processing (e.g., col., 3, lines 44 - 65), wherein said external peripheral block performing said processing (e.g., line 54, col., 7 - line 12, col., 8).

14. As per claim 7, Ogawa teaches the following:

at least two processes a content addressable memory process, a time to live process, comparison process, counter process, a value swapping process, a stuffing process, cyclic redundancy a de-stuffing process, checksum process, a parity process, a first-in- first-out process, a length construction generator header error control synchronization process, a frame relay lookup process, data link connection identifier process, protocol identification analysis process, point-to-point protocol verification process, parameter discard process, and a buffer process (e.g., col., 3, line 60 – col., 4, line 11).

15. As per claim 8, Ogawa teaches the following:

step (B) comprises the sub-step of simultaneously processing a plurality of parameters within said incoming packet (e.g., col., 4, lines 13 - 31).

16. As per claim 10, Ogawa teaches the following:

delineating a receive produce frame from said first network to produce said incoming packet prior to processing said incoming packet prior to processing (e.g., lines 44 - 60, col., 4).

17. As per claim 11, Ogawa teaches the following:

selecting among plurality of frame delineation plurality of network protocols prior to delineating (e.g., line 54, col., 7 - line 12, col., 8).

18. As per claim 12, Ogawa teaches the following:

delineating a second receive frame from said second network to produce said incoming packet (e.g., line 54, col., 7 - line 12, col., 8).

19. As per claim 13, Ogawa teaches the following:

framing said outgoing to produce a transmit frame for said second network in response to presenting said outgoing packet (e.g., col., 3, lines 44 - 65).

20. As per claim 14, Ogawa teaches the following:

selecting among a plurality of framing methods for a plurality of network protocols prior to framing (e.g., lines 21 - 36, col., 10).

21. As per claim 15, Ogawa teaches the following:

framing said output packet to produce a second transmit frame for said network in response presenting said outgoing packet (e.g., lines 2 - 24, col., 9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

22. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

23. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa in view of "Official Notice".

24. As per claim 9, Ogawa teaches the claimed limitation as rejected under claim 1. However, Ogawa does not specifically mention about step (B) being non-programmable. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing step (B) being non-programmable is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include step (B) being non-programmable with the teachings' of Ogawa in order to facilitate non-programmable processing. The concept of non-programmable processing would enhance processing the steps taught by the Ogawa. For example, Yusa et al., 5,633,806, discloses the well-known concept of non-programmable processing (e.g., use of fixed function in the core region, col., 14, lines 6 – 21). The usage of non-programmable circuit design would help increase the degree of freedom of circuit design.

25. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa in view of Wilford et al., 6,687,247 (Hereinafter Wilford).

26. As per claim 18, Ogawa teaches the claimed limitation as rejected under claims 16 and 17. However, Ogawa does not specifically disclose a plurality of peripheral means at least one (i) linked to the pointer and (ii) configured to perform a process involving the first parameter.

Wilford discloses a plurality of peripheral means (e.g., use of modules of memory, figures 9, 10, 15, 26) at least one (i) linked to the pointer (e.g., concept of TAG usage, col., 49, lines 15 – 38) and (ii) configured to perform a process (e.g., process handling information, col.,

6, lines 2 – 23) involving the first parameter (e.g., information including header, etc., col., 5, lines 36 – 51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ogawa with the teachings of Wilford in order to facilitate usage of a plurality of peripherals means because the peripherals would enhance the handling the information associated with the pointer, and the parameter information would help the software to process information for the circuit.

27. As per claim 19, Ogawa and Wilford teach the claimed limitation as rejected under claims 16-18. Wilford also teaches a first plurality (e.g., use of modules of memory that are internal and not external, figures 9, 10, 15, 26, col., 48, lines 39 - 58) of said peripheral means (e.g., use of modules of memory, figures 9, 10, 15, 26) that are internal (e.g., use of modules of memory that are internal and not external, figures 9, 10, 15, 26, col., 48, lines 39 - 58) and a second plurality (e.g., use of modules of memory that are external and not internal, figures 9, 10, 15, 26, col., 48, lines 25 - 37) of said peripheral means (e.g., use of modules of memory, figures 9, 10, 15, 26) that are external (e.g., use of modules of memory that are external and not internal, figures 9, 10, 15, 26, col., 48, lines 25 - 37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ogawa with the teachings of Wilford in order to facilitate internal and external peripheral means. The internal peripherals would enhance supporting information that is within the processing means, while the external peripherals would enhance supporting information that is outside the processing means.

28. As per claim 20, Ogawa and Wilford teach the claimed limitation as rejected under claims 16-19. Wilford also teaches means for interfacing to said first network (e.g., col., 4, lines 46 – 65) configured to de-frame (e.g., col., 2, lines 55 – 67) in compliance with a plurality of network protocol (e.g., col., 4, lines 46 – 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ogawa with the teachings of Wilford in order to facilitate interfacing to a network, to de-frame and support a plurality of network protocol because the de-framing would enhance handling of the information over the network according to the network protocol used. The network would support sending information from one device to another device. The network protocols would provide rules for transferring information among the devices.

Conclusion

29. The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

April 22, 2005